REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's discussion regarding the rejection of claims 34-39 during an August 23, 2004 telephone conference. The rejection does not specifically comment on these claims. The Examiner, however, confirmed that Claims 34-39 were rejected as intended. We discussed features in Claims 34-39 that we believe distinguish the applied prior art as set forth below.

In the Office Action, Claims 3, 28 and 45 have been withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected species.

Claims 1, 6, 11, 15, 16, 20, 21 and 25 have been rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 6, 11, 15, 16, 20, 21, 25 and 29 have been rejected under 35 USC §103 as patentable over Applicants' admitted prior art Figure 2 in view of Lee or in view of Cook and Lee. Claims 1, 3, 6, 11, 15, 16, 20, 21, 25, 28-33, 35, 36, 38, and 40-45 have been cancelled. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

The rejection of Claims 29-44 under 35 USC §103 as patentable over prior art Figure 2 in view of Cook and Lee has been considered.

Independent Claim 34 has been amended to include the features of cancelled dependent Claims 35 and 36. Independent Claim 37 has been amended to include the features of cancelled dependent Claim 38. Thus, only Claims 35, 37 and 39 remain pending in the application.

Claim 34 corresponds to the embodiment illustrated in Applicants' Figure 11(b). Claims 37 and 39 correspond to the embodiment illustrated in Applicants' Figure 11(c).

Applicants' admitted prior art Figure 2 illustrates a weather strip having a metal insert 23 embedded within a grip part 21. A seal part 22 is mounted to the grip part 21 at one of the outer faces thereof.

Figures 3A to 5C of Cook illustrate an internal reinforcement carrier 25 for a door trim that is non-metallic to provide strengthening and stiffening property normally

associated with a metal carrier. Figure 3C shows the carrier 25 embedded in arm portions 29, 31 (55, 57, 59 in the embodiment of Figure 5C) of a securing portion 23.

Lee discloses a weather strip having no embedded reinforcement. The weather strip includes a carrier structure 12 having legs 16, 18 with decreasing thickness 18 and a base 20. The carrier structure 12 has a Shore A durometer hardness of about 70-100. The legs 16, 18 have root portions 30 projecting inwardly from inner walls thereof and flexible tip portions 32 attached to the root portions. The tip portions 32 are not as hard as the root portions and receive a flange 34 therebetween. A seal structure 14 is mounted to an outside surface of the rigid carrier structure 12.

The rejection combines and substitutes selected features from Cook and Lee with prior art Figure 2 to obtain Applicants' invention. Cook discloses providing an embedded thermoplastic material 25 instead of a metal insert. Thus, Cook may arguably be relied upon for substituting a non-metallic rigid part for the metal insert in prior art Figure 2. In such instance, the rigid part would remain completely embedded in the grip body.

Lee, however, discloses a wireless weather strip comprising in its entirety the rigid carrier structure 12. As a grip part, Lee merely discloses tip portions 32 mounted on ends of root portions of the carrier structure. This structure differs greatly from the embedded structures disclosed in prior art Figure 2 and Cook.

For the above reasons, there is no motivation, absent Applicants' specification, to selectively choose and combine features of Lee with prior art Figure 2 and Cook in an attempt to obtain Applicants' claimed invention.

Moreover, Applicants' Claim 34 recites "a seal part secured to the outer face of said rigid part at first and second spaced locations and projecting generally outwardly and away from said grip part, the first location comprising the outer face of said rigid part at the first corner and the

second location comprising the adjacent one of said outer side surfaces".

Cook does not disclose or suggest a seal part secured to a rigid part. Likewise, prior art Figure 2 shows the seal part secured to the grip body. Lee discloses the seal part secured to the grip body at both of the corners of the rigid part, rather than at one corner and an outer face of the rigid part as illustrated in Applicants' Figure 11(b). Thus, Applicants' claimed structure is not present in any of the applied prior art references. Further, there is no motivation, absent Applicants' specification, to combine features from the applied prior art to obtain the structure recited in Claim 34.

Applicants' independent Claim 37 distinguishes the applied prior art. Claim 37 recites that the rigid part has "substantially the same thickness along the entire cross section thereof". This feature is not present in Lee. Claim 37 further recites "a first lip integrally molded to a first one of said facing inner side surfaces of said rigid part" and "a second plurality of spaced inner lips separately integrally molded to the other of said facing inner side surfaces of said rigid part", and "each of the plurality of said inner lips having a length less than the length of said first inner lip". Prior art Figure 2 and Cook do not disclose or suggest a second plurality of spaced inner lips separately integrally molded to the other of said facing inner side surfaces. Both prior art Figure 2 and Cook show the entire interior of the grip body as a monolithic element with projections therefrom. Lee discloses lips mounted to root portions extending outwardly from inner side surfaces of the rigid part thereof.

Once again, there is no motivation, absent Applicant's specification, to selectively choose various elements from Cook and Lee for prior art Figure 2 to obtain Applicants' structure recited in Claim 37. More specifically, there is no reason to reshape the grip body of prior art Figure 2, as

combined with Cook, so that the carrier structure is no longer embedded in the grip body.

Applicants' Claim 39 further distinguishes the applied prior art. Claim 39 recites that "said seal part is integrally molded to one of said outer side surfaces of said rigid part of said grip part at a first location and secured to the grip body of said grip part at a second spaced location".

As discussed above, Cook discloses the seal part mounted to a grip body at one location. Lee discloses the seal part mounted only to the rigid part at two locations. Prior art Figure 2 shows the seal part mounted only to the grip part at two locations. The applied prior art does not disclose or suggest having the seal part secured to both the rigid part and the grip body.

For the above reasons, Claims 34, 37 and 39 are believed distinguishable over the applied prior art.

As discussed above, numerous claims have been cancelled, which reduces the number of issues for consideration. Amended Claim 34 only includes additional features from cancelled Claims 35 and 36. Amended Claim 37 only includes additional features from dependent Claim 38. Thus, there are no new issues that require further consideration or search. Therefore entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

There is no indication that the originally filed formal drawings have been approved. Applicants respectfully request formal approval of the drawings in the next Office Action.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Entry of the amendment and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Tumm

Brian R. Tumm

BRT/ad

FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL
& TANIS, P.C.
2026 Rambling Road
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1631
Phone: (269) 381-1156
Fax: (269) 381-5465

Dale H. Thiel Reg. No. 24 323
David G. Boutell Reg. No. 25 072
Ronald J. Tanis Reg. No. 22 724
Terryence F. Chapman Reg. No. 32 549
Mark L. Maki Reg. No. 36 589
Liane L. Churney Reg. No. 40 694
Brian R. Tumm Reg. No. 36 328
Steven R. Thiel Reg. No. 53 685
Donald J. Wallace Reg. No. 43 977
Sidney B. Williams, Jr. Reg. No. 24 949

Encl: Postal Card